

Conflict over Climate Change Politics

- Governmentality and Resistance to the Expansion of Heathrow Airport

Sebastian Svenberg

*Examensarbete för Master i sociologi
med samhällsanalytisk inriktning
Institutionen för sociologi och
arbetsvetenskap
Göteborgs universitet 2012
Handledare: Linda Soneryd*

ABSTRACT

In 2008, the so-called Climate Change Act went through the UK Parliament. The bill was a commitment to radically reduce carbon emissions. During the same period of time, a third runway was planned at the London Heathrow airport. The aim with this paper is to analyse the controversy that occurs over how the expansion of civil aviation can be connected or disconnected from the politics of climate change. The specific case of Heathrow expansion brings to the fore how certain domains and economic spheres are contested, as they become subjects for incorporation with climate change policy as a discursive practice. In focus of the study are debates in the UK Parliament, as well as contestations in the form of direct actions by the activist network “Plane Stupid”. A disparity in the debate exists between “carbon budget” and “technological enframing”: two competing programmes of government. The distinction between these programmes derives from a difference of relativising and absolutising rationalities. The parliament’s decision over Heathrow is an attempt to mitigate the conflict between conflicting policies. In the direct actions by Plane Stupid the issue is however demonstrated as a conflict, and absolute connections between the question of Heathrow and climate change are visualised. By making contestations of programmes and techniques of government, the practice of resistance relates to and utilise the productive powers of governmentality. The conflict of Heathrow touches upon dynamics of discursive modifications. The control and capacity to define the character of a problem are productive powers that are subjects for continuous negotiations, contestations and conflicts.

Keywords: climate change, governmentality, practice of resistance, Heathrow expansion, programmes of government, rationalities, carbon budget, technological enframing

Introduction

The considerable increased attention to climate change over the last decades, has led to diverse responses from policy actors as well as a multitude of environmental movements. As a complex political issue, it contains tension between economic and societal goals, but also between scientific knowledge and moral reasoning. Debates and controversies on how to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions make such tensions visible. In the UK, processes concerning airport expansions have recurrently been a cause of political controversies. The issue was intensified between the years of 2007-2009, as a planned third runway on London Heathrow airport was brought up to be decided upon in the UK Parliament. Among obstacles for an effortless agreement were reasons concerning climate change policy. The so-called climate-bill (Climate Change Act) was carried through the UK Parliament in 2008, just months before a decision was to be taken about third runway at Heathrow. The climate-bill¹ set out juridically binding² targets of a national 80 per cent decrease of CO₂-emissions within the UK until 2050. Such targets of reduced carbon emissions are potentially in conflict with an expected growth of aviation, because aviation is a source of greenhouse-gas emissions. Together, these two issues – the climate bill and the question of Heathrow expansion – display a broader discursive inconsistency on the question of climate governance.

The planned Heathrow expansion accumulated attention from a growing social movement concerned with the issue of climate change, as well as local networks of citizens in opposition to a third runway. When the local citizen consultation for Heathrow expansion started in 2007, an assembly of protest – so called "climate camp" - was arranged in connection to the settled area for a third runway at Heathrow airport. The activist network "Plane Stupid" took off during this camp, with an outspoken aim to take direct action against aviation- and airport expansion. This occurred in parallel to the process of Heathrow expansion plans, and direct action was carried out prior to, as well as in reaction to, decision in parliament. At Stansted airport, where there was a similar plan for extension, activists from Plane Stupid blocked a runway in December 2008 by chaining themselves together, and the action stopped several planes from taking off. One anonymous activist from Plane Stupid told BBC about the action; "We're here because our parents' generation has failed us and it's now down to young people to stop climate change by whatever peaceful means we have left [...] We're afraid of what the police might do to us, we're afraid of going to jail but nothing scares us as much as the threat of runaway climate change"³.

¹ http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/legislation/cc_act_08/cc_act_08.aspx

² Juridical sanctions for failing to deliver reductions were not set in the bill.

³ http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in_depth/7770513.stm

No domains in society or economic activities, as such, are in themselves linked to the political question of climate change. Instead, the politics of climate change is produced along with a practice of linking economical activities or different societal domains to the issue. This process of expanding politics into the field of climate change is a discursive practice. Such political process might also become a matter of controversies and conflicts. An underlying pledge for expansion of politics is the climate change act. However, what is more to the case are the plans for a third runway at Heathrow. An airport becomes a domain of governance where the planning of mobility infrastructure meets national targets of carbon emission levels. It is a case in which climate change politics and the governing of civil aviation, becomes entangled as a field of negotiations and controversies. The expansion of politics, such as the climate bill, becomes contested in the clash with other fields of governance, such as the domain of airports and civil aviation.

The aim with this paper is to analyse the controversy that occurs over how the expansion of civil aviation can be connected or disconnected from the politics of climate change. The specific case of Heathrow expansion brings to the fore how certain domains and economic spheres are contested, as they become subjects for incorporation with climate change policy. The case also involves practice of resistance in the form of direct actions. The discursive practice of governmentality produces and reflects competing rationalities and programmes of government. The purpose of this study is to generate knowledge of and discuss contestations and controversies with regard to climate change politics and incompatibilities of government. This will be done by the undertaking of a discourse analysis of the contestations and governmentality of Heathrow airport expansion. In focus are the debates in the UK Parliament, as well as contestations in the form of direct actions by the activist network “Plane Stupid”.

What rationalities and programmes of government are produced and reflected within the debate over Heathrow expansion in relation to the climate bill? How do the direct actions by Plane Stupid relate to and visualise the airport expansion as a controversy of climate change politics?

The responding to these questions makes the possibility for another two questions;

How is the question of expanded civil aviation formed and contested in relation to the expansion of politics through climate change governance? What does the case display with regards to politics of climate change as discursive practice of governmentality and as a fragment of social change?

This paper begins with an overview of previous research about contested airports and climate change politics, as well as the studies of movements and campaigns involving these matters. This is followed by the section of theoretical and methodological perspectives for how to study governmentality and practice of resistance. After a brief

outline for selection of the studied material, analysis of the case follows in a longer section with different sub-sections and themes – relating to both the debates in parliament as well as the direct actions by Plane Stupid. The final section makes conclusions about the specific case in relation to asked questions, but also draws some more general outlines about conflicts over politics of climate change.

Previous Research – Politics of Climate Change and Contested Civil Aviation

Politics and Contestations of Expanding Aviation and Airports

This paper is concentrating upon the Heathrow expansion as a question in relation to the governing of climate change. However, it also calls for the question of how an expanding policy of climate change needs to incorporate the sphere of civil aviation as a source of greenhouse gas emissions. It is therefore a conflict of policy upon airport and aviation, as much as it is a matter of climate change politics. As civil aviation and air travel is continuously increasing, it has caused severe attention among studies of policy options and perspectives of mobility planning (eg. Freestone & Baker 2011; Janic 2004; Madas & Zografos 2008). Whereas the focus of these studies is about policy for airport capacity, they also partly discuss *local* environmental concerns, but not necessarily climate change concerns, over such expansions. The expanding aviation sector is also attended to by different studies that focus on air-travel in relation to climate change policy (Cairns et al. 2006; Daley & Preston 2009). A current topic have for example been different views and aspects of the EU-Emission Trading Scheme, and an inclusion of aviation business into that scheme⁴ (Anger & Köhler 2010). Bows & Anderson (2007) have focused on the possible “policy clash” that takes place in the UK, as carbon reduction policy meets demands and expectations for growth within the aviation sector. They evaluate the circumstances and ambitions of the two different policies, and conclude that an incompatibility appear as emissions from aviation are expected to *rise*, while a projected *reduction* of emissions is supposed to take place. The focus on such policy clash is partly tangent to the controversy and perspectives that are brought into focus in this paper. However, what is different in this study, is that I concentrate on what rationalities and programmes that are produced within the conflict, and do not try to evaluate the plausibility, or possibility, for any policy in relation to another. It is a matter of studying the conflict as practice of government and acts of resistance, in what makes up the discursive field of negotiation over civil aviation and politics of climate policy. What

⁴ Aviation became part of the EU Emission Trading Scheme (EU-ETS) during 2012. This is strategy presented as a control of the rising emissions from aviation within the EU.

follows from this is to look further at another field of previous studies that have focused on such conflicts as a matter of governance and competing discourses.

Discourses of Climate Change Politics and the Practice of Governmentality

In broad terms climate change governance⁵ is a discursive field where different policy formations and comprehensions on the problem of climate change meet. A number of studies have addressed the social and discursive constitution of climate change policy (eg. Carvalho & Burgess 2005; Hulme 2009; Weingart et al. 2000). That makes up a field of research that form an understanding of, e.g., norms (Pettenger 2007) perceptions of risk (Leiserowitz 2006) and the character of a society (Zannakis 2009) as essential aspects for the construction of climate change as a social and political issue. They have also displayed that opposing stands occur on climate change as a political question. Competing discourses are for example represented in Bäckstrand & Lövbrands (2006, 2007) study on tree planting as emission reduction-strategy, where market liberal orientations are different to principles within a more equity-oriented stance. On the more specific focus of climate change governance and aviation, it has been presented how aviation industry have produced discourses in which climate change impact from aviation is played down (Gössling Law & Peeters 2007). Other studies have focused on public perceptions and attitudes towards aviation and air-travels in relation to the issue of climate change (Cohen & Higham 2010; Randles & Mander 2009). The approach in this paper has much in common with these different studies in the way policy of climate change is perceived as socially and discursively constructed. However, this paper concentrates on the discursive practice and negotiation of incorporating or disconnecting the civil aviation to the expanding politics of climate change. The general view of discourses in former studies is one of narratives and framings, and an understanding of conflicts through such comprehensions. However, what has not been closely attended to is the field of *discursive practice* and *rationalities* that occur in the clash between the political project of civil aviation and airport infrastructure. This is not only a matter of airport expansion per se, but a field that potentially is linked to climate change politics as discursive practice and *governmentality*.

Governmentality, as a perspective directed towards the phenomena of climate change, has focused on the productive powers that makes the issue governable, such as scientific knowledge and calculations. Studies have also focused on how citizens become responsabilised actors in the governing of climate change (Letell et al. 2011; Rutland & Aylett 2008). Oels (2005) argues that a global “climate regime” has shifted from a focus on

⁵ The term governance will in this paper be used as a general approach to the work of politically handling, attending to or addressing an issue, while government and governmentality are more theoretically loaded terms to be closer explained.

moral responsibilities, to one of measures on the basis of costs. The rationalities of climate change policy are increasingly underpinned by knowledge of economics and cost-benefit analysis (Irwin 2008). The implementation of emission trading schemes and market-based solutions, with the aim to spur technical innovation and economic incentives, are increasingly dominant strategies within climate governance according to Oels. The comprehension from these studies, of climate change governance as a practice, along with the studies of competing discourses, creates an interesting point of departure. From such a point, it can be understood how governmentality carries on inclusion and exclusion of certain concerns. It provides a way of looking at strategies and programmes of government as competing practices and discourses – an understanding that is brought into this study.

Environmental Movements and Contested Airport Expansions

However, climate change as political issue is also shaped by the involvement of social movements. A large field of research have put focus on formations of movements and environmentalism (Carter 2007; Maniates 2001; Mol 2000; Van Der Heijden 1997). Many environmental movements to some extent become part of (a global) environmental governance or exercise influence as institutionalised organisations. It is also argued that homogenisation of perspectives might happen as movements, established institutions and business increasingly relate to political rationalities that favors technical and/or market solutions [see for example (Anshelm & Hansson 2011; Ford 2003)]. However, there is an actor-centred approach in studies quoted above. These studies also reside from political binaries, such as dissent and collaboration, and resistance as utterly opposed to power. Studies might benefit from overcoming such binaries, and look at protest and government as mutually constitutive practice (Death 2010). It does not follow that resistance, as a term, is irrelevant. However, the way forms of resistance might challenge dominant forms of governance, is a matter of empirical question for studies of resistance as *practice*.

Studies have also concerned protests against airports, and the difference of reasons upon which such contestations and conflicts have taken place (Aldrich 2008; May & Hill 2006). Griggs & Howarth (2004; 2008) have analysed different perspectives that have been salient in campaigns against airport expansions in the UK. One study (Griggs & Howarth 1998) focused at the alliances between eco-activists and local "middle-class families" that took place in a campaign against Manchester Airport in 1997. The focus has been a matter of studying the different actors and motives of protests. Stewart (2011) have studied specifically the coalition of local groups and national networks that campaigned to stop the third runway at Heathrow, which is the same particular case as in this paper. It is concluded by Stewart that the wide network of mixed actors and motives were crucial for the campaigns success of stopping an expansion of the airport. Also this study resides to a

large extent from an actor-centric approach, whereas practice of resistance is less attended to.

So, on the one hand there are studies that display framings and narratives within certain (competing) discourses, and studies of climate change as rendered governable through practice of government. On the other hand, there are studies of environmental movements and resistance in relation to climate change, and airport expansions. However, to understand conflict over climate-governance, and how movements act upon such governance, practice of resistance ought to be studied in relation to the programmes and rationalities of government. However, it is still a matter of a more general study of policy for expanding Heathrow airport on the one hand, and an expansion of climate change politics on the other hand. It is within this conflict that different rationalities and programmes take place, as well as practice of resistance relating to that conflict.

Theory and Method for the Study of Governmentality and Practice of Resistance

The Heathrow expansion is in this paper scrutinized as a case in relation to the climate change bill. The plans for a third runway meet the discursive practice of expanding politics of climate change, but is also an issue acted upon within actions of protest. Discursive practice to some extent constitutes and reflects governmentality in relation to the specific case of this study. Power is produced or re-produced as discursive practice in the decision-making process. The examination of resistance in relation to this process put focus on interaction between power and protest – which leads to the question of governmentality and rationalities.

Governmentality and Productive Power

The requisite to understand acts of protest in relation to climate governance, is linked by perspectives and understandings of power. The state, or juridical doctrines of the state, might or might not be of importance within the governing of Climate Change. It is however a question of empirical investigation to understand how government⁶, with the state as one institution among others, is formed in regard to any certain issue (Rose 1999). Governmentality is in this view seen as the analysis of “political power beyond the state” (Miller & Rose 2008: 53), in contrast to search for a dominant power. It is not presupposed that any clear sovereign authority is to be found, and power is rather apprehended as

⁶ Government is not here a term for an entity, such as the government, but used in the sense of network or body politic.

dispersed (Rose 1999). Analysis is therefore focused on *productive power* in the forms of rationalities, techniques and programmes of government. Such an approach to power concentrate on control and regulation as rendered possible through knowledge, knowledgeable spaces and surveillance (Foucault 1984/2002; Oels 2005: 103-04). The practice of governing also recurrently take place in the form of *action at a distance* (Miller & Rose 2008), which refer to a sort of ‘indirect’ mechanisms by transfers of information. Different networks are formed, within which particular objectives are achieved by transfers of information or expertise between them.

Contestation and conflict over relations of power is of latent character, rather than manifest features. What Lukes (1974/2008) called the third face of power is the notion of how latent power is exercised through the way different modes of thought are influenced. Control is a *capacity* which renders something governable, but which also entail power. This is a point that Lukes shares with Foucault (1984/2002). Control and government is a product of power – and a constitutive practice – not in a way it is obscuring something hidden, but in the way instruments and procedures organise thoughts and practice. The result might be that potential conflicts become unknown, and that alternative orders are excluded from discourses. Rationalities of government are not believed to be centrally constituted – and there is in this way no all through empowered unit of force (Foucault 1978/2000: 204). Following from this is that modification and reconfigurations of power is a fluid and slow process. Nonetheless, it is a process of dynamics for constant change and discursive modifications. To study any case of climate change as conflict therefore also partially treat matters of social change, given the view of discursive modifications.

Rationalities of government is one theoretical tool to understand Heathrow expansion and the conflict over climate change policy. Rationalities are coherent systems of thought and strategies accorded to a value of truth (Rose 1999). It is the moral forms, production of knowledge and vocabulary, which render stabilised societal relations through schemata of represented reality. The moral form is about principles and ideas, for example liberal government directed toward justice, economic efficiency, freedom or growth (Rose & Miller 2008:58-59). In its relation to production of knowledge, do such principles give conceptions of the spaces or entities that are governed, such as growth of “the economy” or freedom of “a population”. Further, language and vocabularies accompany rationalities, and render such spaces and entities thinkable.

Principles of the market, liberty of the individual or environmental reasons, become the ideals upon which interventions of government are carried out. However, in the approach of Rose and Miller, governmentality is also about programmes and techniques of government. From specific problems such as aviation and climate change, emerge interventions – *programmes* - in the forms of networks and procedures of governing. These are ways that solutions to a problem are formed. Scientific facts from certain domains such as economics or environmental science, becomes part of a programme within policy or

institutional structures (Lidskog et al. 2010: 23). Knowledge also translates rationalities to something concrete in the way such solutions elaborate on certain theories and explanations. *Technologies of government* make connections between those who govern, and what is governed. With calculations or statistics as techniques of government - different spaces, objects and people can be made governable (Miller & Rose 2008:61-63). Such techniques are a matter of materiality that is produced parallel with programmes of government. In that way, also buildings and documents can be examples of such technologies.

Practice of Resistance

How is it then that practice of resistance can be understood in relation to governmentality and the productive power of rationalities and programmes? *Demonstrations* is a concept where actions of protest are perceived as visualisations of power (Barry 1999). In a wider sense, the term signify for example the witnessing that takes place as a demonstration of laboratory science is conducted. Now, this is another context than the one we usually imagine in the site of political conflict or resistance. However, as the position of protest takes place – is demonstrated - it also manifest a technical and ethical practice that can be witnessed. To make a phenomenon visible is therefore also a practice that produces sites and objects of contestation. Opportunities of resistance can appear through the techniques of government, as well as governable spaces and objects. Rose (1999: 180-81) argues for conceptualizing acts of protest as techniques that emerge from productive powers. Another comprehensive term for strategies of resistance is *techne of struggle* (Foucault et al. 2000: 364; Rose 1999: 281). Such a *techne* is a matter of practicality within actions, and might be for example blockades, break-ins or encountering people. The term is used in this paper for conceptualizing of the way technologies of government can become part of a direct action.

The perspective used here put focus on a discursive field of rationalities and practice of resistance, rather than shared aims, interests or actors in political conflict. The latter is to greater extent a state-oriented approach to study the influence of movements (Della Porta & Tarrow 2005), or a methodological actor-centric approach of collective action (Melucci 1980). The relevance of such focus is not in any way rejected or dismissed, but this paper looks at the discursive field and *practice* of governmentality and resistance, rather than actors of political conflict.

Scientific knowledge, calculations, objects and parliamentary procedures (Foucault 1978/2000: 219) are productive powers that render a problem such as aviation and climate change *governable*. Actions by Plane Stupid might be considered practices that also render these relations of power *resistible*; counter-acts that emerge upon rationalities and techniques of government. It can be the bodies jamming the entry of a building, re-location

of a document or blocking the wheel of an airplane. As such, it is not a matter of solutions to a problem, but a practice that potentially produce symbolic or actual friction⁷ in relation to governmentality.

Discourse Analysis and the Study of Governmentality and Practice of Resistance

Political rationalities, as well as programmes and techniques of government, have been reviewed as a body of theory and methods for this study. The study has a focus on parliamentary debates as *discursive practice*. The parliament is a space where articulations of governmentality take place, and where the controversy over climate change is formed. However, it cannot reveal an insight of the actual practice of government as it is undertaken through all different domains of knowledge-production and technologies of government. The analysis of political rationalities and governmentality is instead made through the possibility to discern discursive regularities within the examined material (Rose & Miller 2010: 276). Within rationalities occur regularities on *moral* forms, *epistemological* characteristics and *vocabulary*. This should not be understood as an attempt to identify different clearly defined discourses. Political rationalities do not have the systemic and closed character of a theoretical discourse (Rose & Miller 2010: 178). It is rather a matter of looking for the ideals and principles that guides objectives for government and form its objects. As Heathrow expansion is debated there is also a forming of programmes, and certain technologies of government are articulated. Governmentality has a discursive character in the way it depends on representations (Miller & Rose 2008: 31). Discursive practice and procedures arguably *displays* the governing process, but is also what to some extent *constitutes* governmentality. The different plans, schemes and objectives that make up programmes of government, are elaborated through language. Conceptions of the ideals and principles of government are articulated within a wider discursive field, and an attention to language is required to analyse it (Miller & Rose 2008: 30). So, as a specific problem is addressed, it is also identified, represented and constructed through discursive practice. Actions of government are related to discursive production of what is to be governed, and in such an active role does it render domains and problems governable.

The point of departure in the procedure of analysis is an understanding of discourse as constituted by *statements*, according to the conceptualisation of statements by Foucault (1969/2002: 132-40) A statement is outspoken in a text, but it might as well be what is left out. The statements in a discursive formation shape regularities. The many different statements of text and practice constitute regularities within a certain system of thoughts

⁷ The word friction is here a way to term results of dissent as practice. In contrary to rationalities, programmes and institutional settings, which lubricate governing, friction marks out impedance to such power.

and objects⁸. Such regularities are studied and understood as reflecting and constituting rationalities, as well as programmes and techniques of government. Different constellations of statements also produce different meanings and system of thoughts. It is in these regularities that rationalities are reflected and constructed.

From the texts of Plane Stupid, I have summarized what happens in every action, but also taken notes on interpretations of every piece of text. This gives pieces of the material, validated toward plausibility of every abstraction. I look for the way actions activate techniques of government or relate to rationalities. This is the way demonstrations are understood as a practice of resistance. The procedure of texts from the debate is similar. The difference is that within the all through reading of this material, I have identified *passages* on the criteria of utterances relating to climate change, greenhouse-gas emissions or mitigation strategies, and alike. From these passages, I have deduced summarising sentences – statements. These collected statements have been coded into categories of coherent articulations shaping political rationalities and as reflection on programmes of government. It is from the different categories that I form an understanding of governmentality and the practice of resistance.

The Case of the Study and the Selection of Material

The case of this study is a planned expansion of London Heathrow airport. The selected material for the study is debates in the UK Parliament, and documentations of direct actions by Plane Stupid. UK has been chosen on the reason for its commitments of the climate bill; to reduce greenhouse gas emission, in combination with a decade of discussions about the business of aviation as a matter of environmental impact. The debates on plans for an airport expansion are understood as representative for the undertaking of negotiations over claims for emission reductions in relation to the specific domain of aviation. Greenhouse gas emissions from aviation is considered part of the anthropogenic contribution to climate change⁹ (IPCC et al. 2008; Randles & Bows 2009), and therefore arguably of potential relevance for the work of mitigation and climate governance. Within the EU, the quantity of CO₂ emissions from aviation has been rising with 5-7 % annually since 1993 (Bows et al. 2009; EEA 2011). In the UK, the context for the case in this study, is an absolute increase of emissions from aviation expected (Cairns

⁸ This is also partly similar to Laclau & Mouffes (2008) perspective of discourse theory.

⁹ The CO₂ has a stronger greenhouse effect when it is released on high altitude. An airplane driven by jet-fuel (kerosene) is emitting of a few different greenhouse-gases when burnt, and besides CO₂ the climate impact resides from NO_x (enhance ozon concentrations, deplete methan) and H₂O (formation of contrails and cirrus clouds) (Azar & Johansson 2012). Climate impact from aviation is estimated to be between 1,3 - 2,9 times stronger than the effect of CO₂ alone (ibid).

et al. 2006), which makes up one point of reference in the debate on aviation and climate change.

In the parliament resolve regarding the case, it was decided to allow an expansion of Heathrow. The expansion was however cancelled in the parliament later same year, after decision by a newly elected coalition government. The analysis in this paper put focus on the debate before the first decision to allow expansion. Material from UK Parliament consists of debates in the “House of Commons”. “Heathrow expansion” and “Third runway” has been searched for between the dates of 16 October 2008 and 28 January 2009. Dates are motivated by the carry through of the climate-bill, and latter date on the decision to approve London Heathrow expansion. The debates between these dates, on the issue of “Heathrow expansion”, make up approximately 250 pages of text.

Plane Stupid is a loose, UK based network of activists, partially utilising civil disobedience as campaign-methods. The direct actions from Plane Stupid took off during and after the consultation period of Heathrow expansion plans, as well as after the (first) parliamentary decision to go along with the plans. News, activities and actions by Plane Stupid are written about on a blog. A selection of text and documented actions on this blog is used as material. I have chosen to study text and actions within the blog-category of “Heathrow”, between the 15 January 2009 and 26 Mars 2010. These dates differ from the selection of the debate, but the dates are motivated for the reason that actions happened not only prior to decision in the parliament, but also after the decision. The material of texts and documentations from the blog makes up approximately 43 pages of text including 7 documented actions.

Climate Change Governance and Actions of Protest – Analysis of the Conflict over Heathrow Airport Expansion

The question of airport expansion highlights a potential controversy, as there exists a tension between expansion of civil aviation and the commitments to reduce carbon emissions. Assessments and estimations over aviation a source of emissions, forms the basis upon which aviation is considered an issue of relevance in regards to climate change politics, or not. An airport becomes in this case a domain of governance where the planning of mobility infrastructure meets *national* targets of carbon emission levels. Aviation mobility-systems requires a network of interdependent immobile fixed moorings (Urry 2007). Creation of aviation-systems is the establishment of stationary infrastructure within an order of national control by regulations and surveillance. The forming of policy has consequences for airports capacity and functioning, through which the mobility of aviation is made possible. It meets, however, other nationally based policies such as the climate bill. From the debate in the UK Parliament, it can be distinguished how

commitments to a climate bill, in relation to the Heathrow expansion, activates a controversy of principles within the nation-state;

”We cannot on the one hand say, ”We want to lead globally on this” which all the main parties agree on – and then on the other hand say ”We are going to build this extra runway” (Mr. Brazier UK Parl. 11 Nov. 2008: column 737). To put it bluntly, tripling Britain’s airport capacity is irreconcilable with meeting our climate change mandatory targets. A parliamentary answer in April this year made it clear that aviation already accounts for 13 per cent. of the UK’s total climate change impact. That is quite a high figure, but the key point is that it is now the fastest-rising generator of greenhouse gases in Britain (Mr. Meacher UK Parl. 11 Nov. 2008: column 708).

The governing of Heathrow expansion, against a background of climate bill commitments, is entwined into a difficulty of resolving whether continued growth for aviation is reasonable or not. What is stated in the quote is an opposition, for climate change reasons, towards allowing airport expansion. However, on a cursory level, a general concern of aviation and climate change is *shared* as political point of departure in the parliament. It is not, manifestly, a conflict about scientific “truths” as real or not. However, whereas aviations impact on the climate is not contested per se, controversy does rather emerge on the question of what meaning such facts are to be given. Different programmes of government appear in relation to such divergent rationalities that are formed and negotiated within the debate over Heathrow expansion.

Programmes of Government - Technological Enframing and Carbon Budget

Governing of climate change is developed according to different principles and values of truth, and as well is the governing of civil aviation. Programmes of government conceptualise the *different* ways an issue is discursively constructed and governed. The Heathrow expansion is a matter of meanings attached to the knowledge and facts surrounding the issue. Such knowledge and expertise is a way by which power is produced and certain potentials are given to programmes of government.

The first of two programmes reflected in the debate is *carbon budget*. The term is a type of scheme, which refers to a cap on total greenhouse-gas emissions within the UK. As such, it can also be seen as a *programme* to cut emissions by careful planning. It is expected that the climate bill target of 80 per cent emission-reduction, is to be conducted with the help of 5-year carbon budgets. From such principles derive that different *sources* of greenhouse gas emissions are compared and negotiated in relation to each other. In the debate are for example the (emission-) effects of short and middle-haul flights put into comparisons with the building of high-speed rail. These comparisons come along with reasoning on what consequences the different infrastructural systems might have within a carbon budget.

Such calculations and comparisons are part of a wider controversy over possible consequences from permitting or disallow an expansion of Heathrow;

“The figures in the official documents state that 11.7 million tonnes of CO2 equivalents will be emitted as a result of the third runway, on an annualised basis. How do we translate that? If we were to offset it by something positive, it would mean that we had to deliver and install 7.2 million solar roofs in the UK. If we take out apartment blocks and everything north facing, it probably means the entirety of south-facing roofs in the UK” (Mr. Simpson UK Parl. 28 Jan. 2009: column 390).

The effect of a “carbon budget” narrative is here that it posits carbon emissions from aviation as negotiable and accounted for in relation to other national sources of carbon emissions. Climate impact is therefore discursively positioned within the country; a territorial framework, as well as emissions from aviation are organised around a “future” cap; a chronological framework. This gives an *ideal* of a *nation state* taking responsibility for outcomes of its present government in relation to outcomes in the *future* – in regards to *absolute* emission levels. This should be understood a category of rationality for climate governance. It is also a programme of government in the way certain strategies for how to govern climate change are established, but also in the way rationalities are translated to practicality.

Climate-governance within carbon budget is ideally a programme of careful planning for infrastructure and energy use. I want to, however, emphasise networks of power not as a function *by* the state, but instead rationalities and programmes of government rather as *outcomes* of power. Programmatic elements are not something that simply is implemented in the form of top down strategy from a state. Rationalities of government can be understood as organising principles, and government is a matter of decentralised apparatus of control within many different sectors. A carbon budget is a programme that demands further political response and new institutional settings – practical work of governance.

*Technological enframing*¹⁰ is a second of two programmes that have come to be understood as coherent categories within the material of parliament debates. Technical possibilities and economic reasons are the centre of technological enframing. An organising principle is the connection between economic and technological progress, and as such should climate change be governed in accordance with ideals of economic efficiency. Implementation of mechanisms and incitements for intensified development of technology within the aviation business is an answer to the question of aviations climate impact. The principles within this programme are therefore forms of ensuring capacity for aviation infrastructure, as much as it is a matter of climate change policy. Anticipations for

¹⁰ Technological enframing is originally a concept from Heidegger (1993), but Irwin (2008) also relate this term to the politics of climate change. A central meaning of the term is that calculation and production of scientific knowledge lies at the heart of managing the world as a stock of potential resources and standing reserves.

technical development forms a narrative of continued decoupling and separation between aviation and its environmental impact;

Modern aircraft are quieter and less polluting than older aircraft. [...] Those improvements in technology will continue, ensuring that aircraft are quieter, more fuel efficient and less polluting. To reinforce that trend we intend to make new capacity at Heathrow subject to a green slot principle to incentivise the use of the most modern aircraft (Mr. Hoon UK Parl. 28 Jan. 2009: column 319).

A comprehension of emission-levels as connected to *efficiency* is here emphasised. Because improvements of efficiency (mainly) depends on technologic development, the statement represents a reliance on what is seen as *continued* performance of technical solutions to reach reduction of emissions. The premise of efficiency and technology is narrated as a progress – that there was a time when environmental impact was more significant, but that circumstances are changing and that technical knowledge within business of aviation is improving. Efficiency is something that put emphasis on *relative* decrease, as it posit the ratio between input and output as a focal point. In comparison to a carbon budget, *absolute* growth of emission from aviation is implicitly played down within the rationality of technological enframing. Another disparity is the difference of stipulated market mechanisms, such as a green slot principle, in contrast to the carbon budgets careful planning and comparisons between different domains of carbon emissions.

Governmentality is here formed in relation to the specific case of decision over airport expansion and in relation to climate change governance as discursive field. Programmes of government emerge from political and discursive practice; assembling information, gaining knowledge and public consultations. Discursive inclusion and exclusion-practices are forming different political rationalities regarding the linkages between climate change and aviation. Governmentality is a forming of the way a problem is handled, how relations of productive power are created, and on what ideals governing is based. The climate change does not, however, stand as a reason for governing in itself. The facts on climate impact from aviation do not constitute themselves as part of governmentality. The documents, information and technical calculations, such as a white paper for the future of aviation or reports on numbers from different sources of emissions, are entities within the creation of programmes. However, meaning is given to such entities when political subjects handle and treat them as part of the climate change issue. Economic activity becomes part of *environmental discourse*, and externalities such as climate impact from aviation are that way rendered governable as environmental governance. What is constructed is a *controlled* and predictable relationship between economic activities and their "external" outcomes. The consequence of seemingly control and surveillance over a matter might however also produce less appearance of inconsistencies or conflicts.

The Decision on Heathrow as Mitigation of Climate Change Conflict

The actual decision on Heathrow is in many ways an attempt to mitigate the contradictions and controversies that appears in the debate. The controversy in the parliament is, in simplified terms, on whether commitments of the climate bill possibly can be met, even if expansions of airports are allowed. The third runway is permitted in the parliamentary resolve. However, as decision is taken, there are attempts to mitigate such a conflict through the way governmentality is formed. This decision involves a text, where it is stated that monitoring and surveillance of carbon emissions should be done. On what can be seen as a type of *action at a distance*, certain conditions are set for how BAA, the owner of Heathrow, is to manage the airport. A comment on this is that "for the first time we are saying that aviation expansion is conditional on improvements and reductions in carbon emissions" (UK Parl. 28 Jan. 2009: column 405). A so-called "Committee on Climate Change" is to execute the enforcement of surveillance and monitoring of expansion, according to specified rules and limits that BAA should submit to. The committee on Climate Change was constructed as response to the climate bill agreement. Its mission is to provide independent advice to the Government, on setting and meeting targets of the climate bill, but also to monitor the progress of emission-reductions in the UK. In the text of decision, it is expressed that this is a way to put in place "enforceable mechanisms that will be independently monitored" (UK Parl. 28 Jan. 2009: column 406).

Programme of government is made practicable through the way techniques of government, such as the documents and calculations from Committee on Climate Change, are given a role in the governing-process. Another technique is the so-called "green slots", which means a certain type of permission. Only new "efficient" planes with low environmental impact are permitted slots (take-off permissions) on the third runway. In relation to such *anticipated* technical development of efficient planes, claims the Minister of Energy and Climate Change that the extension of Heathrow is not considered to be "devastating" for the UK's climate change commitments. This is also an utterance for how the parliament decision is given a compromising character regarding climate change governance – a mitigation of the issue as a controversy. However, there is an inherent tension in the contradictory principles for aviation growth as part of technological enframing; and aims for absolute reduction of emissions as part of carbon budget. In some part, the decision is a discursive overlapping of the categories. It is however plausible to say that the decision foremost represents a programme of technological enframing. Expectations of efficient planes and the effects of green slots reflect a focus on (economic) efficiency rather than absolute reductions of emissions. Operating mechanisms are related to a rationality of anticipated technological development and a comprehension of airports as a standing reserve for a supposed continued growth of aviation.

With the decision emerge the operation of specific strategies for solving problems, such as the committee on climate change. It is a form for how expertise becomes part of the

programmes for infrastructure planning and climate governance. The decision to expand Heathrow is discursively made possible to take without rejecting ideals of climate responsibility, because it rests on premises for control and responsibility to be taken elsewhere than in parliament. Such action at a distance, along with networks of expert-knowledge, makes the conflicts over climate governance and aviation delegated and postponed to other levels. A legacy is also formed on climate governance as an “independent” instrumental monitoring, as the committee of climate change is expressed. Techniques of government, such as the green slots, inscribe the state into networks of power between state-implemented systems and business-management. Such dispersed productive power rests on a network of expertise rather than a central position of moral or political stand by politicians within the parliament. The governing exists in many different spheres, but a dispersed power makes inconsistencies between programmes less manifest. The result is a delegation of moral and political questions to areas of expertise and business, and conflicts in the parliament are to some extent mitigated and made less severe. However, the political conflict over different programmes of government, only apparently diminishes. The decision is taken within a discursive field of continuous negotiations over the meaning of climate change politics in relation to the domain of civil aviation.

There exists a tension, sometimes manifest and sometimes latently reflected in the debate. It is stemming from the controversy in the parliament, but also from how the issue becomes a wider social issue and motive for direct actions;

This is a major decision that will, as the Secretary of State said, affect the long-term interests of our economy. It will also make or break our climate change policy. [...] The policy will cause immense social division within the country. Many people are disillusioned with the whole process of consultation, assessment and policy making that the Government have undertaken. They are angry, and the anger is building. I believe that it is building into a form of direct action the like of which neither the Government nor the country have ever seen. We saw what happened at the climate camp, but Heathrow is becoming the iconic battleground for the climate change campaign, not only in Britain but throughout Europe (Mr. McDonnell UK Parl. 11 Nov. 2008: column 672).

The Heathrow expansion is, in the quote above, connected to a general climate change controversy in the UK and throughout Europe. In this paper, there is no attempt to display the influence from direct actions in relation to the parliament debate. However, the quote is a comment on Heathrow expansion as a wider conflict, outside the process of decision-making and beyond locality of the immobile infrastructure of an airport. There are no clear answers to what kind of parliamentary political responses that should be expected. However, it is a reflection of conflicts upon policy, and a controversy that includes also practice of resistance. In the quote is the issue expressed as a conflict that cannot be mitigated or delegated. Such notion of Heathrow expansion adverts to how the Heathrow expansion demonstrated as a conflict within the actions of protest.

Actions of Demonstrating Conflict

As the decision represents an attempt to mitigate a conflict over climate change and aviation, the practice of resistance is rather a way of demonstrating and visualising conflict. Within the direct actions is expansion of aviation manifested as something that cannot be disconnected or decoupled from its impact on climate change. A first example of action where this is made, is when Dan Glass, a 24 year old activist in Plane Stupid, is "super-gluing" himself to Prime Minister Brown's suit. It is done in a situation where Dan is in the State Dining Room at 10 Downing street, for receiving an award that is traditionally handed out by the Prime minister. At the moment of handshake, Dan put his other arm full of super-glue on the prime-ministers arm. As disruption occurs, he reads out testimonies from people that will be negatively affected by the planned third runway, as well as testimonies from communities around the world that are already threatened and affected by current climate-change. He says to the Prime minister, regarding these testimonies, that "we cannot shake away climate change like you just can't shake away my arm"¹¹. Aviation and its impact on the climate manifestly are glued to each other, and the question of airport expansion is visualised as unconnectedly related to climate change impacts.

At that *moment* of action, it is not possible to "shake away climate change". What otherwise can mitigate a conflict, such as *anticipations* for future possibilities and solutions, is here demonstrated as a conflict that *already* takes place. When reading out testimonies from communities affected by climate change, it is not about calculations of a distant future, but stories of what is already happening. The theme of climate change as a conflict in the *present* also recurrently occurs within the comments on different actions. It is stated for example that; "We're the last generation who can stop climate change, and we're not going to sit around waiting for politicians to catch up"¹². As anticipation for technological development is part of *mitigating* a conflict in the present – actions of protest *demonstrates* a conflict that occurs in the present. The latent tension of the present and the future is also discernible in the comment of a "last generation", which posits a generation in relation to the "waiting" for politician's postponed acts on climate change.

The way expansion is outspoken as "conditioned" by responsibility for climate change is something that Plane Stupid are disputing. As Heathrow expansion is handled and decided over, the expansion is discursively constructed as "green". This is done for example by the "green" slots. Moreover, the actual planning of extension is operated by what is called "green architecture". Within the parliament debate, it is argued that strong technical development can lead to decreased (relative) emissions by higher efficiency. On such

¹¹ <http://www.planestupid.com/content/plane-stupid-campaigner-superglues-himself-prime-minister-inside-number-10>

¹² <http://www.planestupid.com/content/plane-stupid-campaigner-superglues-himself-prime-minister-inside-number-10>

premises, there can be a growth of aviation but still ensuring decreased emissions - what is also sometimes called "green growth". Plane Stupid acts towards the *architectural process* of the third runway, as it is considered part of such discursive practice. When an award for third runway design is handed out on an architect event, Plane Stupid makes a *storming* of the conference and unexpectedly takes over the stage. From the stage is a speech enacted about aviation as a part of the climate change problem, as well as the handing of a "shame-award" to the architect-firm that is about to be awarded for their plans on (prospective) Heathrow extension. Within the text on this action is it expressed that "green" design for the creation of an airport extension is impossible; "Trying to build a green airport is like trying to polish a turd"¹³. The "greening" of airport design is demonstrated as a conflict and contradiction, rather than a possibility. Practice of resistance demonstrate relations of power and produce friction against the mitigation of conflict between climate change policy and the building of a third runway.

The Practicality of Resistance

In order to demonstrate contradictions and relations of power, the strategies of resistance make use of objects and techniques of government. Demonstration is therefore something that happens through the ways that *objects of contestation* are established. As this case is a matter of infrastructural planning, also the actual airport becomes a contested *site* within the actions. The struggle against Airport expansions contains breaking and enters on airfields, as well as "human-blocking" around the wheel of a jumbo-jet. By such practice, objects of contestation are established in relation to the infrastructure of airports. An infrastructure that has been made a governable space by different programmes of government. The airport and governing of airport are objects of regulation, but also become sites and object of contestation within practice of resistance – in this case acted upon within a wider context of climate change politics.

The contestations of objects and spaces are established as a practicality of resistance – the ways through which components of the issue are used for demonstration and visualisations. The House of parliament and the office of BAA are for example established as spaces of contestation in two different actions. Before a session of "Questions for the prime minister", about the plans for Heathrow extension, huge banners are hung up from the roof of parliament. Their banners are saying "NO 3rd RUNWAY" and "BAA HQ" (head-quarter), which is not only a sight for people passing by but also becomes a picture well spread in the media. In the action, Plane Stupid are illegally entering the roof of the parliament building. The day of the action is also last day of the public consultation period. From that location are copied documents, revealing "proofs" of connections between BAA

¹³ <http://www.planestupid.com/blogs/2009/11/6/heathrow-campaigners-storm-architect-awards-warn-third-runway-bids>

and the government, thrown out in the form of paper aeroplanes from the roof of Parliament. The sheets are internal documents from the consultation process, and they are showing that part of the consultation-papers has been written by BAA. What is demonstrated in these actions is not the conflict per se, but the governmentality of aviation as related to interests by BAA. It demonstrates relations between BAA and politicians in what is visualised as process driven by certain interests, in which the question of aviation is illegitimately unlinked to the issue of climate change. What is confronted is namely not only the obscured relations, but also that the consultation paper has not included climate impact as part of the question, which is seen as an obscuring of aspects concerning aviations climate impact. In the other action relating to BAA, Plane Stupid are chaining themselves to what they call the "revolving doors" to BAA Heathrow headquarter, which imply their intimate relation with the government. This is followed by papers that are handed out with "the science of climate change", to people that are blocked from entering the building.

The way resistance is formed and acted out is something I here understand as matter of *practicality*. The consultation-papers are part of the way a third runway is politically handled - techniques of government in a practical sense. As these documents are used within the action, they are constructed as objects of contestation. The parliament building, a space of government, is also utilised as an opportunity for practice of resistance. The strategy in these actions can be seen as its *techne of struggle* (Rose 1999: 281). The concept of *techne* is something that connotes to a *practicality* (Foucault 2000: 364). While techniques of government are practicalities of political programmes, the *techne of struggle* is a practicality inherent for the practice of resistance. The *techne* is here the utilisation and contestation of a physical building, by hanging banners and spreading leaflets. The roof is a way of visualising, and the objects contested in the demonstration – the parliament building and documents on the consultation process – become part of a strategic use. The practicality of the action of gluing oneself to the Prime ministers arm is a friction on the actual possibility to move freely. The body and clothes of a Prime minister are used as practical objects for visualisation and demonstration. The practice of resistance this way engages networks of power to demonstrate and brace one's feet against what is produced within the consultation process and the procedure of decision in the house of parliament.

An important point in the actions is to demonstrate a significant gap between *decision* to radically reduce carbon emissions and the economic efficiency as rationality within the governing of airport expansion. Resistance occurs in the forms of demonstrated conflicts and production of friction. Technologies of government are objects such as the consultation documents or building of the parliament. Such objects, along with spaces of government such as the airport, are constructed as opportunities for demonstrations and visualisations. What is contested is the type of postponement such as *anticipatory future narratives*, and the expectations of a *green growth* as a decoupling narrative. In a more

general sense the actions do manifest and visualise conflicts and contradictions in the governance of climate change on the one hand, and the governing of Heathrow expansion on the other hand.

Conclusions

The questions in this paper treat the forming of climate change governance as a social and political phenomenon in relation to an airport expansion. The specific case of aviation and Heathrow airport becomes a controversy, as it arguably should be attended to as a question of climate change governance. Continued growth of aviation is from such point stated as incompatible with the targets for reduced greenhouse gas emissions. As response to the problem of climate change and aviation, competing programmes are represented within the parliament debate. This study has identified two competing programmes of government: *carbon budget* is related to clear defined limits of absolute levels of carbon emission. By a focus on planning and budgets, this programme does reflect rationality of a nation state that takes responsibility for its emission in the present. *Technological enframing* is instead primarily constructed upon knowledge of technical engineering and operation of market mechanisms. It reflects a rationality and ideal of relative decoupling between aviation and its climate impact, mainly by intensified technical development. However, while there exists conflicting programmes and rationalities, the actual decision is an attempt to mitigate such conflict, as it tries to take the edge of contradictions. In contrast to this, the practice of resistance by Plane Stupid as a demonstration of expanded civil aviation as an issue of conflict in relation to the question of climate change. What is at stake in this conflict is the expansion of civil aviation in opposition to the expansion of the new politics of climate change.

The specific case is relevant for broader comprehensions of climate change politics, not only in relation to the issue of civil aviation or politics of the UK. The case does however have some specific features. First, the debate in the parliament proceeds from a perspective in which emissions from international flights are accounted for, in practice, as part of UK's total emission levels. The contrary to this is to account for emissions only within geographic territory of the UK. This is done interchangeable between different countries and different sources of emission. This is the difference between what is called a consumption perspective, in opposite to a production perspective (Aall & Hille 2010). It relates to the distinction between a source of emission and the consumption that generates it. The production and consumption is often geographically separated. A somehow mixed model is used for the most, when accounting for greenhouse gas emissions. A second specific feature of this case is that aviation is a domain where particular "technical solutions" for emissions-reductions seems to be less likely than certain other domains, such as land-travel or district heating (Peeters et al. 2009). About this study in regard to

previous research, it is discernible how different features of the categories of carbon budget and technological enframing, in a general sense have occurred in former research of environmental discourses. The discourses of Ecological modernisation (Hajer 1995), Liberal Environmentalism and Administrative rationalism (Zannakis 2009) have similarities with the programmes of government identified in this paper. However, to specify these features by relating it to the specific case, along with a further understanding of rationalities and programmes of government, adds to a more specified conceptualisation of governmentality in relation to climate change.

Conflicting Programmes and the Difference between Relativising and Absolutising Rationalities

To bring the case from its specific features to a broader understanding is addressed by the last couple of questions that are guiding this study. The issue of civil aviation is formed and contested in relation to the expansion of politics through climate change governance. Such conditions are more general than just the case, of significance for different societal domains in relation to the politics of climate change. The different programmes of government in this case tend to contradict each other, as technological enframing and carbon budget are two rivaling programmes. Such relations of contradictions between programmes are something that Rose and Miller emphasise as characteristic; “The world of programmes is heterogeneous and rivalrous [...] the solutions for one programme tend to be the problems for another” (Miller & Rose 2008: 71). The way controversies are formed and handled within the debate, adds in a broader sense to an understanding of discursive constitution of inconsistencies, as a matter of negotiation and practice of governmentality. However, the study does also bring more profound understanding to the expansion of the politics of climate change, as such politics relates to and potentially incorporate different societal domains.

The conflict that appears can be conceptualised with a couple of terms. On the one hand, there is the approach of governing climate change through restriction of particular activities or sources of carbon emissions. This can be seen as an *absolutising* rationality, which appears within the programme of carbon budget. The programme is a matter of restricting sources of emissions, according to an absolute limit. On the other hand, technological enframing is an approach of work for emission reductions through improved technology, and an expected “greening” of activities by greater efficiency. This represents a *relativising* rationality. The actual decision over Heathrow is interpreted as an attempt to mitigate the contradictions and controversy that appears. This mitigation of conflict can be seen as a way of relativising the issue. The relativisation is done, for example, by the way it is delegated and postponed. The “greening” of aviation also rests on ideals of decoupling between aviation and its environmental impact.

The practice of resistance by Plane Stupid are in these terms a matter of absolutising the question. The “greening” of an airport expansion is for example demonstrated as an inconsistency, not as a possibility. Their actions also visualise a conflict that appears in the *present*, which is another form of absolutising principle, in contrast to narratives of *future* solutions. These conflicts between absolutising and relativising rationalities is highly relevant for a general understanding of conflicts and controversies over climate change politics. What is related to as a *general* concern over “scientific facts” of climate change, are given different meanings according to rationalities such as these. The difference of rationalities is a way through which climate change, as political issue, is given different meanings. The distinction between absolutising and relativising rationalities is a broader conceptualisation of the conflicts that appear over climate change politics as it expand through incorporation of different societal domains.

Governmentality, Practice of Resistance and Fragments of Social Change

The analysis of this case has concerned the practice and negotiation of governmentality. There are certain forms of productive power occurring in this case and which can be understood as a general feature of productive power and climate change politics. What is partly at stake within governmentality, and the construction of programmes, is the control and capacity to define the character of a problem. It is formed in relation to climate change as an issue in the present, but also towards expectations for the *future*. Control, as a form of productive power, is shaped through narratives, calculations and beliefs about future events. Power within climate change governance is, to a great extent, based upon anticipation and prospects. As the probability of circumstances is reflected upon – projected - and becomes part of a planning process, it is arguably so that the anticipation and prospects plays a part. It is a matter of materialities; such as documents, reports, statistics; but also immaterialities, such as promises and threats (cf. Anderson 2007). Such elements render potentialities of the present, as well as *creation of futures*. Projected events of the future - for example stipulated development of technology or certain trend lines - are real in effect on the present, even though such eventualities and visualisations always are very uncertain outlooks. It has here been pointed out how anticipation for the future becomes a field of struggle over (sometimes) shared concerns but from conflicting views. However, as the creation of future is a field of discursive practice, it is also a matter of competing productive powers, in the way governmentality is negotiated by its practice.

The question of climate change, and the relations between governmentality and practice of resistance, is to some extent a matter of social change. The relation between productive powers and practices of resistance makes up a dynamic in the field of protest, where the contester and the contested are not separated, but entangled with each other. The techniques of government, such as buildings or documents, as well as spaces such as

airports, become components within the direct action by Plane Stupid. However, such a relation might also be a way to understand practice of resistance and demonstrations as a fragment of social change. Practices of resistance have the potential to produce transformations of power, and modify the settings of productive power. To empirically display such transformations has not been accomplished here, but the analysis of the case shows a dynamic of discursive change. Such gradual social change is related to what Foucault (1969/2002) propose as points of *diffraction of discourses*, which can be an analytical tool to see moments of alternative or incompatibility to dominant worldviews. However, it is not a matter of change in the meaning of possessed power, but rather a continuously disrupt and reinforcement of different conditions. The conflicts within the specific case of Heathrow, touches upon dynamics of discursive modifications and more general societal negotiations or conflicts over environmental issues. Practice of resistance can, over such matters, potentially alter and change relations of power.

What has been focused in this paper is the question of climate change politics as a broad discursive field of negotiations and controversies. The practice of governing displays different meanings and rationalities attached to the concern of climate change, as it meets the question of Heathrow expansion. The construction of climate change as a political issue is a continuous process of discursive practice, but also a relation of productive powers in relation to different practices of resistance. As an expanding field of politics, the issue of climate change brings comprehensions and tensions over economic activities and societal goals.

References:

Aall, Carlo & Hille, John (2010), 'Consumption - a missing dimension in climate policy', in Roy Bhaskar (ed.), *Interdisciplinarity and climate change : transforming knowledge and practice for our global future* (London ;: Routledge), 85-99.

Aldrich, Daniel P. (2008), *Site fights: divisive facilities and civil society in Japan and the West* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Anderson, Ben (2007), 'Hope for nanotechnology: anticipatory knowledge and the governance of affect', *Area*, 39 (2), 156-65.

Anger, Annela & Köhler, Jonathan (2010), 'Including aviation emissions in the EU ETS: Much ado about nothing? A review', *Transport Policy*, 17 (1), 38-46.

Anshelm, Jonas & Hansson, Anders (2011), 'Climate Change and the Convergence between ENGOs and Business: On the Loss of Utopian Energies', *Environmental Values*, 20 (1), 75-94.

- Azar, Christian & Johansson, Daniel (2012), 'Valuing the non-CO2 climate impacts of aviation', *Climatic Change*, 111 (3), 559-79.
- Barry, Andrew (1999), 'Demonstrations: sites and sights of direct action', *Economy and Society*, 28 (1), 75-94.
- Bows, Alice & Anderson, Kevin L. (2007), 'Policy clash: Can projected aviation growth be reconciled with the UK Government's 60% carbon-reduction target?', *Transport Policy*, 14 (2), 103-110.
- Bows, Alice, Anderson, Kevin, & Footitt, Anthony (2009), 'Aviation in a Low-carbon EU', in Stefan Gössling & Paul Upham (eds.), *Climate change and aviation : issues, challenges and solutions* (London ; Sterling, VA: Earthscan), 89-112.
- Bäckstrand, Karin & Lövbrand, Eva (2006), 'Planting Trees to Mitigate Climate Change: Contested Discourses of Ecological Modernization, Green Governmentality and Civic Environmentalism', *Global Environmental Politics*, 6 (1), 50-75.
- (2007), 'Climate Governance Beyond 2012: Competing Discourses of Green Governmentality, Ecological Modernization and Civic Environmentalism ', in Mary E. Pettenger (ed.), *The social construction of climate change : power, knowledge, norms, discourses* (Global environmental governance; Aldershot: Ashgate).
- Cairns, Sally, Newson, Carey, Boardman, Brenda, & Anable, Jillian (2006), 'Predict and decide : aviation, climate change and UK policy : final report / Sally Cairns and Carey Newson with Brenda Boardman and Jillian Anable', (Oxford: Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford), 118 p.
- Carter, Neil (2007), *The politics of the environment : ideas, activism, policy* (2. edn.; Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press) xxi, 410 p.
- Carvalho, Anabela & Burgess, Jacquelin (2005), 'Cultural Circuits of Climate Change in U.K. Broadsheet Newspapers, 1985–2003', *Risk Analysis*, 25 (6), 1457-69.
- Cohen, Scott Allen & Higham, James E. S. (2010), 'Eyes wide shut? UK consumer perceptions on aviation climate impacts and travel decisions to New Zealand', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14 (4), 323-35.
- Daley, Ben & Preston, Holly (2009), 'Aviation and Climate Change: Assessment of Policy Options ', in Stefan Gössling & Paul Upham (eds.), *Climate change and aviation : issues, challenges and solutions* (London ; Sterling, VA: Earthscan), 347-72.
- Death, Carl (2010), 'Counter-conducts: A Foucauldian Analytics of Protest', *Social Movement Studies*, 9 (3), 235-51.
- Della Porta, Donatella & Tarrow, Sidney G. (2005), 'Transnational processes and social activism : an introduction', in Donatella Della Porta & Sidney G. Tarrow (eds.), *Transnational processes and social activism* (Rowman & Littlefield), 1-14.

EEA, European Environment Agency (2011), *Laying the foundations for greener transport: TERM 2011 : transport indicators tracking progress towards environmental targets in Europe* (Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Union).

Ford, Lucy H. (2003), 'Challenging Global Environmental Governance: Social Movement Agency and Global Civil Society', *Global Environmental Politics*, 3 (2), 120-34.

Foucault, Michel (1969/2002), *Vetandets arkeologi*, trans. C. G. Bjurström & Sven-Erik Torhell (Arkiv moderna klassiker; Lund: Arkiv).

--- (1978/2000), 'Governmentality', in Paul Rabinow, James D. Faubion, & Robert Hurley (eds.), *Essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984. Vol. 3, Power* (New York: The New Press), 201-22.

--- (1984/2002), *Sexualitetens historia 1* (Bokförlaget Daidalos).

--- (2000), 'Space, knowledge and power', in Paul Rabinow, James D. Faubion, & Robert Hurley (eds.), *Essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984. Vol. 3, Power* (New York: The New Press), 349-64.

Foucault, Michel, Rabinow, Paul, Faubion, James D., & Hurley, Robert (2000), *Essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984. Vol. 3, Power* (New York: The New Press).

Freestone, Robert & Baker, Douglas (2011), 'Spatial Planning Models of Airport-Driven Urban Development', *Journal of Planning Literature*, 26 (3), 263-79.

Griggs, S. & Howarth, D. (1998), 'Vegans and volvos' Problematizing and explaining the campaign against Manchester Airport's second runway', (Essex Univ., Colchester (United Kingdom). Dept. of Government ;).

--- (2008), 'Populism, localism and environmental politics: The logic and rhetoric of the stop stansted expansion campaign', *Planning Theory*, 7 (2), 123-44.

Griggs, Steven & Howarth, David (2004), 'A transformative political campaign? The new rhetoric of protest against airport expansion in the UK', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 9 (2), 181-201.

Gössling Law, Stefan & Peeters, Paul (2007), 'It Does Not Harm the Environment! An Analysis of Industry Discourses on Tourism, Air Travel and the Environment', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15 (4), 402-17.

Hajer, Maarten A. (1995), *The politics of environmental discourse : ecological modernization and the policy process* (Oxford: Clarendon).

Heidegger, Martin (1993), *The question concerning technology and other essays*, trans. William Lovitt (New York: Harper & Row).

Hulme, Mike (2009), *Why we disagree about climate change : understanding controversy, inaction and opportunity* (Cambridge ;: Cambridge University Press).

- IPCC, Pachauri, Rajendra K., & Reisinger, Andy (2008), 'Climate change 2007 : synthesis report Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change', (Geneva, Switzerland).
- Irwin, Ruth (2008), *Heidegger, politics and climate change : risking it all : Continuum studies in Continental philosophy* (London: Continuum International Publishing Group).
- Janic, Milan (2004), 'Expansion of Airport Capacity at London Heathrow Airport', *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 1888 (-1), 7-14.
- Laclau, Ernesto & Mouffe, Chantal (2008), *Hegemonin och den socialistiska strategin* (Göteborg ::Glänta).
- Leiserowitz, Anthony (2006), 'Climate Change Risk Perception and Policy Preferences: The Role of Affect, Imagery, and Values', *Climatic Change*, 77 (1), 45-72.
- Letell, M., Sundqvist, G., & Elam, M. (2011), 'Steering through the neighbourhood: towards an advanced liberal risk society?', *Environment and Planning A*, 43 (1), 106-25.
- Lidskog, Rolf, Soneryd, Linda, & Ugglå, Ylva (2010), *Transboundary risk governance* (London: Earthscan).
- Lukes, Steven (1974/2008), *Maktens ansikten*, trans. Henrik Gundenäs ([Ny utök. utg.] edn.; Göteborg: Daidalos)
- Madas, Michael A. & Zografos, Konstantinos G. (2008), 'Airport capacity vs. demand: Mismatch or mismanagement?', *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 42 (1), 203-26.
- Maniates, Michael F. (2001), 'Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World?', *Global Environmental Politics*, 1 (3), 31-52.
- May, Murray & Hill, Stuart B. (2006), 'Questioning airport expansion, A case study of Canberra International Airport', *Journal of Transport Geography*, 14 (6), 437-50.
- Melucci, Alberto (1980), 'The new social movements: A theoretical approach', *Social Science Information*, 19 (2), 199-226.
- Miller, Peter & Rose, Nikolas S. (2008), *Governing the present : administering economic, social and personal life* (Cambridge: Polity).
- Mol, Arthur P.J (2000), 'The environmental movement in an era of ecological modernisation', *Geoforum*, 31 (1), 45-56.
- Oels, Angela (2005), 'Rendering climate change governable: From biopower to advanced liberal government?', *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 7 (3), 185-207.
- Peeters, Paul, Williams, Victoria, & de Haan, Alexander (2009), 'Technical and Management reduction potentials', in Stefan Gössling & Paul Upham (eds.), *Climate change and aviation : issues, challenges and solutions* (London ; Sterling, VA: Earthscan), 293-307.

Pettenger, Mary E. (2007), 'The Netherlands' Climate Policy: Constructing Themselves/ Constructing Climate Change', in Mary E. Pettenger (ed.), *The social construction of climate change : power, knowledge, norms, discourses* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Plane Stupid, Blog and Actions at <http://www.planestupid.com/>

Randles, Sally & Mander, Sarah (2009), 'Aviation, consumption and the climate change debate: "Are you going to tell me off for flying?"', *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 21 (1), 93-113.

Randles, Sally & Bows, Alice (2009), 'Aviation, emissions and the climate change debate', *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 21 (1), 1-16.

Rose, Nikolas (1999), *Powers of freedom : reframing political thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rose, Nikolas & Miller, Peter (2010), 'Political power beyond the State: problematics of government', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 61, 271-303.

Rutland, T. & Aylett, A. (2008), 'The work of policy: actor networks, governmentality, and local action on climate change in Portland, Oregon', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 26 (4), 627-46.

Stewart, John (2011), 'How the campaign to stop the third runway was won', *Soundings*, 47 (47), 95-108.

UK Parl. (11 Nov. 2008), 'House of Commons Debate', (London: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmhansrd/cm081111/debindx/81111-x.htm>).

--- (28 Jan. 2009), 'House of Commons Debate:' (London <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmhansrd/cm090128/debindx/90128-x.htm>).

Urry, John (2007), *Mobilities* (Cambridge: Polity) vii, 335 p.

Van Der Heijden, Hein-Anton (1997), 'Political opportunity structure and the institutionalisation of the environmental movement', *Environmental Politics*, 6 (4), 25-50.

Weingart, Peter, Engels, Anita, & Pansegrau, Petra (2000), 'Risks of communication: discourses on climate change in science, politics, and the mass media', *Public Understanding of Science*, 9 (3), 261-83.

Zannakis, Mathias (2009), *Climate policy as a window of opportunity Sweden and global climate change* (Gothenburg studies in politics,; Gothenburg: Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg)